Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/01/03: CIA-RDP90-00965R000100160042-1

ARTICLE APPEARED ON PAGE £23

THE WASHINGTON POST 8 October 1981

## LACK ANDERSON

## **Understated View** Of Soviet Might

Last week with much fanfare. American people and our European Defense Secretary Caspar W. Wein allies. herger released a 99-page assessment At another point, the defense secof Soviet military power in hopes of retary made a brief reference to the persuading the American public and Russians' ability to reload their inour NATO allies that the Russian tercontinental ballistic war machine poses a serious threat to Western security.

But Weinberger didn't reveal the whole story; for some reason. A topsecret document obtained by my associate Dale Van Atta shows that the situation is even worse than Weinberger described it.

The document is the current Military Posture Statement prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It was the principal source of Weinberger's One of the most disturbing secpublic report.

Some of Weinberger's omissions were minor, such as his descriptionof Soviet long-range air forces as "more than 800 strike and support aircraft," when the Joint Chiefs' re- sians have been feverishly developport puts the number at 874 deployed at 25 airfields throughout the Soviet Union.

Some were more serious. For example, referring to the Soviets' electronic jamming and interception techniques, Weinberger did not add Soviets are working "on an ABM

Weinberger Gives and counter U.S. radar and communications signals from ground, air, naval and space platforms." That pretty well covers the field, and the Russians obviously know they have this capability. But Weinberger chose not to disclose this to the

> launchers. But he omitted the Joint Chiefs' admission that our intelligence agencies have so far been unable to come up with important details of the Soviets' reloading capability. "The time required to refurbish and reload ICBM launchers is not known, nor is the survivability of the silo launcher or key logistics and support functions," the secret posture statement acknowledges.

tions of the Joint Chiefs' report concerned anti-ballistic missile defense. Weinberger didn't even touch on the subject in his public report.

As I reported last May, the Rusing their ABM system, despite the. strict limitations of the 1972 U.S.-Soviet. ABM treaty. The United States, meanwhile, has let its ABM program lag.

The secret report notes that the this ominous appraisal by the Joint system—the ABM-X-3—which

could be deployed rapidly to defead; large parts of the Soviet landmass." This suggests a significant mobility that has no U.S. counterpart.

In addition, the Joint Chiefs reported, the Russians have hugge phased-array radar networks under construction that would spot and zero in on incoming missiles for Soc. viet ABM interceptors. They even pinpointed the four construction" sites and warned that work at the" last-named site "may now be com" plete," or will be soon:

"Another large phased-array radar" recently was identified under construction north of Moscow," the Joint Chiefs reported. "Although it is:" too early to determine its functional with confidence, it probably is de-,; signed for battle management of the Moscow area BMD (ballistic missile: defense) system.

"The Soviets have been deploying, and testing an ABM-X-3 system at Sary Shagan for over 15 years, Pris mary efforts appear to be devoted toward development of a discriment nation ability, rather than operation al deployments."

The secret report points to recent activity around Moscow as evidence that "a launcher replacement program is under way." The ABM treaty permits 100 launchers around Moscow; in 1979, there were 64, but last year this was reduced to 322 This suggests the Soviets are planning to replace Moscow's missile der fense system with improved ABMach